arXiv:1604.01747v1 [math.AP] 6 Apr 2016

SYMMETRIZATION OF EXTERIOR PARABOLIC PROBLEMS AND PROBABILISTIC INTERPRETATION

KONSTANTINOS DAREIOTIS

Abstract. We prove a comparison theorem for the averages of the solutions of two exterior parabolic problems, the second being the "symmetrization" of the first one, by using approximation of the Schwarz symmetrization by polarizations, as it was introduced in [4]. This comparison provides an alternative proof, based on PDEs, of the isoperimetric inequality for the Wiener sausage, which was proved in [14].

1. Introduction

In the present article we prove a comparison theorem for the average in space, at any time t, for the solutions of two parabolic exterior problems, the second being the "symmetrization" of the first one. In order to do so, we show that the average of the solution decreases under polarization, and since the Schwarz symmetrization is the limit of compositions of polarizations, we carry the comparison to the limit. This technique was introduced in [4].

Our result is motivated by a problem in probability theory. Namely, the isoperimetric inequality for the Wiener sausage, which was proved in [14]. The problem is the following. If $(w_t)_{t\geq 0}$ is a Wiener process in $\mathbb{R}^d$, one wants to minimize the expected volume of the set $\cup_{t\leq T}(w_t + A)$, for $T \geq 0$, over "all" subsets A of $\mathbb{R}^d$ of a given measure. It was proved in [14] that the minimizer is the ball (the result was for a more general setting, see Section 2 below). This was proved by obtaining a similar result for random walks by using rearrangement inequalities of Brascamp-Lieb-Luttinger type on the sphere, which were proved in [6], and then by Donsker's theorem, the authors obtain the result for the Wiener process. It is known that the expected volume of the Wiener sausage up to time t, can be expressed as the average in $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ of the probability that a Wiener process starting from $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ hits the set A by time t. It is also known that this collection of probabilities, as a function of (t, x), satisfies a parabolic equation on $(0, T) \times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$. For properties of these hitting times and applications to the Wiener sausage we refer the reader to [3] and references therein, and for the case of Riemannian manifolds, we refer to [10]. Therefore, we provide an alternative proof of the isoperimetric inequality for the Wiener sausage, based on PDE techniques.

Comparison results between solutions of partial differential equations and solutions of their symmetrized counterparts, were first proved in [15]. Since

then, much work has been done in this area, for elliptic and parabolic equations, and we refer the reader to [13], [12], [2], [4] and references therein. The equations under consideration at these works, are on a bounded domain, with Dirichlet or Neumann boundary conditions. Our approach is based on the techniques introduced in [4].

Let us now introduce some notation that will be frequently used throughout the paper. We denote by $\mathbb{R}^d$ the Euclidean space of dimension $1 \leq d < \infty$. For A, B subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, we write

$$A + B := \{z \in \mathbb{R}^d \mid z = x + y,\ x \in A,\ y \in B\},$$

and for $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we write $x + A := \{x\} + A$. The open ball of radius $\rho > 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^d$ will be denoted by B_ρ. Let $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$ and $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ and let H be a closed half-space. If A is measurable, $|A|$ will stand for the Lebesgue measure of A. We will write $\sigma_H(x)$ and A_H for the reflections of x and A respectively, with respect to the shifted hyperplane ∂H. We will write $\overline{A}$ and $\underline{A}$ for the closure and the interior of A respectively. We will use the notation $P_H A$ for the polarization of A with respect to H, that is

$$P_H A := \Big((A \cup A_H) \cap H \Big) \cup \Big(A \cap A_H \Big).$$

For a non-negative function u on $\mathbb{R}^d$ we will write $P_H u$ for the polarization of u with respect to H, that is

$$P_H u(x) = \begin{cases} \max\{u(x), u(\sigma_H(x))\}, & \text{if} x \in H \\ \min\{u(x), u(\sigma_H(x))\}, & \text{if} x \in H^c \end{cases}$$

We will denote by $\mathcal{H}$ the set of all half-spaces H such that $0 \in H$. For positive functions f and g on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and for $H \in \mathcal{H}$, we will write $f \lhd_H g$, if $f(x) + f(\sigma_H(x)) \leq g(x) + g(\sigma_H(x))$ for a.e. $x \in H$. For a bounded set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, we will denote by V^* the closed, centered ball of volume $|V|$. For a positive function u on $\mathbb{R}^d$ such that $|\{u > r\}| < \infty$ for all $r > 0$, we denote by u^* its symmetric decreasing rearrangement. For an open set $D \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ we denote by $H^1(D)$ the space of all functions in $u \in L_2(D)$ whose distributional derivatives $\partial_i u := \frac{\partial}{\partial x_i} u$, $i = 1, .., d$, lie in $L_2(D)$, equipped with the norm

$$\|u\|^2_{H^1} = \|u\|^2_{L_2} + \sum_{i=1}^{d} \|\partial_i u\|^2_{L_2}.$$

We will write $H^1_0(D)$ for the closure of $C^\infty_c(D)$ (the space of smooth, compactly supported real functions on D) in $H^1(D)$. We will write $\mathbb{H}^1(D)$, and $\mathbb{H}^1_0(D)$ for $L_2((0,T); H^1(D))$, and $L_2((0,T); H^1_0(D))$ respectively. Also we define , $\mathscr{H}^1(D) := \mathbb{H}^1(D) \cap C([0,T]; L_2(D))$ and $\mathscr{H}^1_0(D) := \mathbb{H}^1_0(D) \cap C([0,T]; L_2(D))$. The notation $(\cdot, \cdot)$, will be used for the inner product in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Also, the summation convention with respect to integer valued repeated indices will be in use.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state our main results. In Section 3 we prove a version of a parabolic maximum

principle, and some continuity properties of the solution map with respect to the set A. These tools are then used in Section 4 in order to prove the main theorems.

2. Main results

Let $(\Omega, \mathscr{F}, \mathbb{P})$ be a probability space carrying a standard Wiener process $(w_t)_{t\geq 0}$ with values in $\mathbb{R}^d$, and let A be compact subset of $\mathbb{R}^d$. For $T \geq 0$ we let us consider the expected volume of the Wiener sausage generated by A, that is, the quantity $\mathbb{E}\left|\cup_{t\leq T}(w_t + A)\right|$. In [14], the following theorem is proved.

Theorem 2.1. *For any $T \geq 0$ we have*

$$\mathbb{E}\left|\cup_{t\leq T}(w_t + A^*)\right| \leq \mathbb{E}\left|\cup_{t\leq T}(w_t + A)\right|. \tag{2.1}$$

The result in [14] is stated for open sets A, and the set A is allowed to depend on time. As it was mentioned above, this was proved by obtaining a similar inequality for random walks, using rearrangement inequalities of Brascamp-Lieb-Luttinger type on the sphere, which were proved in [6], and then by using Donsker's theorem, the authors obtain the inequality for the Wiener process.

Let us now move to our main result, and see the connection with Theorem 2.1. For a compact set $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, and for $\psi \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$, let us denote by $\Pi(A, \psi)$ the problem

$$\begin{cases} dv_t = \frac{1}{2}\Delta v_t \; dt & \text{in } (0,T)\times \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A; \\ v_t(x) = 1 & \text{on } [0,T]\times \partial A; \\ v_0(x) = \psi(x) & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

Definition 2.1. We will say that u is a solution of the problem $\Pi(A, \psi)$ if

i) $u \in \mathscr{H}^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$,
ii) for each $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$,

$$(u_t, \phi) = (\psi, \phi) - \int_0^t \frac{1}{2}(\partial_i u_s, \partial_i \phi)\; ds,$$

for all $t \in [0,T]$
iii) $v - \xi \in \mathbb{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$, for any $\xi \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $\xi = 1$ on a compact set A', $A \subset \underline{A'}$.

The following is very well known.

Theorem 2.2. *There exists a unique solution of the problem $\Pi(A, \psi)$.*

Our two main results read as follows.

Theorem 2.3. *Let $\psi \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, $\psi = 1$ on A. Let u, v be the solutions of the problems $\Pi(A, \psi)$ and $\Pi(P_H A, P_H \psi)$, extended to 1 on A and $P_H A$ respectively. Then for all $t \in [0,T]$, we have $v_t \lhd_H u_t$.*

Theorem 2.4. *Let $\psi \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $0 \leq \psi \leq 1$, and $\psi = 1$ on A. Suppose that $|A| > 0$. Let u, v be the solutions of the problems $\Pi(A, \psi)$ and $\Pi(A^*, \psi^*)$ respectively . Then for any $t \in [0, T]$ we have*

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v_t \, dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t \, dx, \tag{2.3}$$

where u_t and v_t are extended to 1 on A and A^* respectively.

It is easy to check that

$$\mathbb{E}\,|\cup_{t\leq T}(w_t + A)| = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} \mathbb{P}(\tau_A^x \leq t) \, dx.$$

where

$$\tau_A^x := \inf\{t \geq 0 : x + w_t \in A\}.$$

It is also known that the unique solution of the problem $\Pi(A, 0)$ is given by

$$u_t(x) = \mathbb{P}(\tau_A^x \leq t). \tag{2.4}$$

Consequently Theorem 2.1 follows by Theorem 2.4 by choosing $\psi = 0$, if $|A| > 0$. If $|A| = 0$ then (2.1) trivially holds.

Remark 2.1. All of the arguments in the next sections can be repeated in exactly the same way, if the operator $\frac{1}{2}\Delta$ is replaced by an operator of the form $L_t u := \partial_i(a_t^{ij}\partial_j u)$, such that for $j, i \in \{1, ..., d\}$, $a^{ij} \in L_\infty((0, T))$, and there exists a constant $\kappa > 0$ such that for almost all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$a_t^{ij} z_i z_j \geq \kappa |z|^2, \tag{2.5}$$

for all $z = (z_1, ..., z_d) \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Consequently one can replace w_t in Theorem 2.1 by "non-degenerate" stochastic integrals of the form $y_t = \int_0^t \sigma_s \, dB_s$ where B_t is an m-dimensional Wiener process and σ is a measurable function from $[0, T]$ to the set of $d \times m$ matrices such that $(\sigma_t \sigma_t^\top)_{i,j=1}^d$ satisfies (2.5).

3. Auxiliary Results

In this section we prove some tools that we will need in order to obtain the proof our main theorems. Namely, we present a version of the parabolic maximum principle for functions that are not necessarily continuous up to the parabolic boundary. The maximum principle is the main tool used in order to show the comparison of the solution of the problem $\Pi(A, \psi)$ and its polarized version. The reason that we need this version of the maximum principle is that, $P_H A$ is not guaranteed to have any "good" properties, even if ∂A is of class C^∞, and therefore one can not expect the solution of $\Pi(P_H A, P_H \psi)$ to be continuous up to the boundary. We also present some continuity properties of the solution map with respect to the set A, so that we can then iterate Theorem 2.3 with respect to a sequence of half-spaces and pass to the limit, in order to obtain Theorem 2.4.

In this section we consider $a^{ij} \in L_\infty((0,T)\times\mathbb{R}^d)$ for $i,j=1,...,d$, and we assume that there exists a constant $\kappa>0$ such that for any $z=(z_i,...,z_d)\in\mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$a_t^{ij}(x)z_iz_j \le \kappa|z|^2,$$

for a.e. $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbb{R}^d$. We will denote by $K:=\max_{i,j}\|a^{ij}\|_{L_\infty}$. For an open set $Q\subset\mathbb{R}^d$, let $\Psi(Q)$ be the set of functions $u\in\mathscr{H}^1(Q)$, such that for any $\phi\in C_c^\infty(Q)$

$$(u_t,\phi)=(u_0,\phi)-\int_0^t(a_s^{ij}\partial_i u_s,\partial_i\phi)\,ds, \tag{3.6}$$

for all $t\in[0,T]$. Notice that by the De Giorgi-Moser-Nash theorem, if $u\in\Psi(Q)$, then $u\in C((0,T)\times Q)$.

Let us also introduce the functions $\alpha_r(s)$, $\beta_r(s)$ and $\gamma_r(s)$ on $\mathbb{R}$, for $r>0$, that will be needed in the next lemma, given by

$$\gamma_r(s)=\begin{cases}2 & \text{if } s>r\\ \frac{2s}{r} & \text{if } 0\le s\le r\\ 0 & \text{if } s<0,\end{cases}$$

$$\beta_r(s)=\int_0^s\gamma_r(t)\,dt,\qquad \alpha_r(s)=\int_0^s\beta(t)\,dt.$$

For all $s\in\mathbb{R}$ we have $\gamma_r(s)\to 2I_{s>0}$, $\beta_r(s)\to 2s_+$ and $\alpha_r(s)\to(s_+)^2$ as $r\to 0$. Also, for all $s\in\mathbb{R}$ and $r>0$, the following inequalities hold

$$|\gamma_r(s)|\le 2,\ |\beta_r(s)|\le 2|s|,\ |\alpha_r(s)|\le s^2.$$

Lemma 3.1. *Let Q be a bounded open set and let $u\in\Psi(Q)$. Suppose that there exists $M\in\mathbb{R}$, such that $u_0(x)\le M$ for a.e. $x\in Q$ and $\limsup_{(t,x)\to(t_0,x_0)}u_t(x)\le M$ for any $(t_0,x_0)\in(0,T]\times\partial Q$, then*

$$\sup_{t\in[0,T]}\sup_{Q}u_t(x)\le M.$$

Proof. Let us fix $t'\in(0,T)$, and let $\zeta\in C_c^\infty(B_1)$ be a positive function with unit integral. For $\varepsilon>0$ and $\delta>0$, set $\zeta^\varepsilon(x)=\varepsilon^{-1}\zeta(x/\varepsilon)$ and $M^\delta:=M+\delta$. For $x\in Q^\varepsilon:=\{x\in Q|\text{dist}(x,\partial Q)>\varepsilon\}$, we can plug $\zeta^\varepsilon(x-\cdot)$ in (3.6) in place of ϕ to obtain

$$u_t^\varepsilon(x)-M^\delta=u_{t'}^\varepsilon(x)-M^\delta+\int_{t'}^t(a_s^{ij}\partial_j u_s,\partial_i\zeta^\varepsilon(x-\cdot))\,ds,$$

for all $t\in[t',T]$, where $u^\varepsilon=u*\zeta^\varepsilon$. Let also $g^n\in C_c^\infty(Q)$ with $0\le g^n\le 1$, $g^n=1$ on $Q^{1/n}$, $g^n=0$ on $Q\setminus Q^{1/2n}$ and choose $\varepsilon<1/2n$. We can then multiply the equation with g^n, and by the chain rule we have

$$\begin{aligned}\int_Q\alpha_r((u_t^\varepsilon-M^\delta)g_n)\,dx=&\int_Q\alpha_r((u_{t'}^\varepsilon-M^\delta)g_n)\,dx\\ &-\int_{t'}^t\int_Q(a_s^{ij}\partial_j u_s)^\varepsilon\partial_i(g_n\beta_r((u_s^\varepsilon-M^\delta)g_n)\,dxds.\end{aligned}$$

By standard arguments (see e.g. [8]), letting $\varepsilon \to 0$, leads to

$$\begin{aligned}\int_Q \alpha_r((u_t - M^\delta)g_n)\ dx = &\int_Q \alpha_r((u_{t'} - M^\delta)g_n)\ dx \\ &- \int_{t'}^t \int_Q g_n^2 a_s^{ij} \partial_j u_s \gamma_r(u_s - M^\delta)\partial_i(u_s - M^\delta)\ dxds \\ &- \int_{t'}^t \int_Q a_s^{ij} \partial_j u_s \partial_i g_n \beta_r((u_s - M^\delta)g_n)\ dxds \\ &- \int_{t'}^t \int_Q a_s^{ij} \partial_j u_s \gamma_r((u_s - M^\delta)g_n)(u_s - M^\delta)g_n \partial_i g_n\ dxds \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Let us also introduce the notation

$$U_t^\delta = \{x \in Q|\ u_t(x) > M + \delta\}.$$

We claim that there exists $\rho > 0$ such that $\operatorname{dist}(\overline{U_t^\delta}, \partial Q) > \rho$ for any $t \in [t', T]$. For each $t \in [t', T]$, we have $\overline{U_t^\delta} \subset Q \cup \partial Q$. Suppose now that there exists $z \in \overline{U_t^\delta} \cap \partial Q$. By the definition of U_t^δ we have that

$$\limsup_{Q \ni x \to z} u_t(x) \geq M + \delta,$$

while by assumption we have that

$$\limsup_{Q \ni x \to z} u_t(x) \leq M,$$

which is a contradiction, and therefore $\overline{U_t^\delta} \subset Q$ which means that $\operatorname{dist}(\overline{U_t^\delta}, \partial Q) > 0$ (the sets are compact). If $\inf_{t \in [t', T]} \operatorname{dist}(\overline{U_t^\delta}, \partial Q) = 0$, we can find $(s, y) \in [t', T] \times \partial Q$, and a sequence $(t_n, x_n) \in [t', T] \times U_{t_n}^\delta$ such that $(t_n, x_n) \to (s, y)$ as $n \to \infty$. Then we have by the definition of $U_{t_n}^\delta$,

$$\limsup_{(x_n, t_n) \to (s, y)} u_{t_n}(x_n) \geq M + \delta,$$

while by assumption again we have that

$$\limsup_{(x_n, t_n) \to (s, y)} u_{t_n}(x_n) \leq M,$$

which is a contradiction, and therefore

$$\inf_{t \in [t', T]} \operatorname{dist}(\overline{U_t^\delta}, \partial Q) = \theta > 0. \tag{3.8}$$

Going back to (3.7), for any $n > 1/\theta$, we have that for all $s \in [t', T]$

$$\int_Q \partial_i u_s \partial_i g_n \beta_r((u_s - M^\delta)g_n)\ dx = \int_{U_s^\delta} \partial_i u_s \partial_i g_n \beta_r((u_s - M^\delta)g_n)\ dx = 0,$$

since $\partial_i g_n = 0$ on $Q^{1/n}$ and $U_s^\delta \subset Q^{1/n}$ by (3.8). Similarly for the last term on the right hand side of (3.7). Therefore, letting $n \to \infty$ and $r \to 0$ in (3.7) gives

$$\|(u_t - M^\delta)_+\|^2_{L_2(Q)} = \|(u_{t'} - M^\delta)_+\|^2_{L_2(Q)} - \int_{t'}^t \int_Q |\partial_i u_s|^2 I_{u_s > M^\delta}\, dxds$$
$$\leq \|(u_{t'} - M^\delta)_+\|^2_{L_2(Q)}.$$

The above inequality holds for any $t' \in (0, T]$, and therefore by letting $t' \downarrow 0$ and using the continuity of u (in $L_2(Q)$) we have

$$\|(u_t - M^\delta)_+\|^2_{L_2(Q)} \leq \|(u_0 - M^\delta)_+\|^2_{L_2(Q)} \leq 0,$$

since $u_0 \leq M$. Consequently

$$\sup_Q u_t(x) \leq M + \delta,$$

for any $t \in [0, T]$. Since δ was arbitrary, the lemma is proved. □

We now continue with the continuity properties of the solution map. Lets us fix $\xi \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $f \in L_2((0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$. We will say that u solves the problem $\Pi_0(A, \xi, f)$ if

i) $u \in \mathscr{H}^1_0(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$, and
ii) for each $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$,

$$(u_t, \phi) = (\xi, \phi) + \int_0^t \left((f_s, \phi) - (a_s^{ij} \partial_i u_s, \partial_j \phi)\right)\, ds,$$

for all $t \in [0, T]$.

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\xi^n \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, $f^n \in L_2((0,T) \times \mathbb{R}^d)$ and let $A_n \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact sets.

Assumption 3.1.

(i) $\xi^n \to \xi$ weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$
(ii) $f^n \to f$ weakly in $L_2([0,T]; L_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$
(iii) $A_{n+1} \subset A_n$ For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $\cap_n A_n = A$.

Lemma 3.2. *Suppose Assumption 3.1 holds, and let u^n and u be the solutions of the problems $\Pi_0(A_n, \xi^n, f^n)$ and $\Pi_0(A, \xi, f)$ respectively . Let us extend u^n and u to zero on A_n and A respectively. Then*

i) *$u^n \to u$ weakly in $\mathbb{H}^1_0(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $n \to \infty$,*
ii) *$u^n_t \to u_t$, weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $n \to \infty$, for any $t \in [0, T]$.*

Proof. Let us set $C_n = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A_n$ and $C = \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$. Clearly, for (i) it suffices to show that there exists a subsequence with u^{n_k} such that $u^{n_k} \to u$ weakly in $\mathbb{H}^1_0(C)$. By standard estimates we have that there exists a constant N depending only on d, K, κ, and T, such that for all n

$$\sup_{t \leq T} \|u^n_t\|^2_{L_2(C_n)} + \int_0^T \|u^n_t\|^2_{H^1_0(C_n)}\, dt \leq N(\|\xi^n\|^2_{L_2(C_n)} + \int_0^T \|f^n_t\|^2_{L_2(C_n)}). \tag{3.9}$$

Since u^n are zero on A_n, we can replace C_n by C in the above inequality, to obtain that there exists a subsequence $(u^{n_k})_{k=1}^{\infty} \subset \mathbb{H}_0^1(C)$, and a function $v \in \mathbb{H}_0^1(C)$ such that $u^{n_k} \to v$ weakly in $\mathbb{H}_0^1(C)$.

For $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$ we have that for all k large enough $\text{supp}(\phi) \subset C_{n_k}$. Also, u^{n_k} solves $\Pi_0(A_{n_k}, \xi^{n_k}, f^{n_k})$, and therefore

$$(u_t^{n_k}, \phi) = (\xi^{n_k}, \phi) + \int_0^t \left((f_s^{n_k}, \phi) - (a_s^{ij} \partial_i u_s^{n_k}, \partial_j \phi) \right) \, ds \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.10}$$

which by letting $k \to \infty$ gives

$$(v_t, \phi) = (\xi, \phi) + \int_0^t \left((f_s, \phi) - (a_s^{ij} \partial_i v_s, \partial_j \phi) \right) \, ds \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0,T], \tag{3.11}$$

which also holds for any $\phi \in H_0^1(C)$, since $C_c^\infty(C)$ is dense in the later. Hence v belongs to the space $\mathscr{H}_0^1(D)$ (by Theorem 2.16 in [11] for example), and is a solution of $\Pi_0(A, \xi, f)$. By the uniqueness of the solution we get $u = v$ (as elements of $\mathscr{H}_0^1(C)$), and this proves (i).

Let us fix $t \in [0,T]$. It suffices to show that there exists a subsequence $u_t^{n_k}$ such that $u_t^{n_k} \to u_t$ weakly in $L_2(C)$ as $k \to \infty$. Notice that by (3.9), there exists a subsequence $u_t^{n_k}$ which converges weakly to some $v' \in L_2(C)$. Again, for $\phi \in C_c^\infty(C)$ and k large enough, we have that (3.10) holds. As $k \to \infty$, the right hand side of (3.10) converges to the right hand side of (3.11) (for our fixed $t \in [0,T]$), which is equal to (u_t, ϕ), while the left hand side of (3.11) converges to (v', ϕ). Hence, $v' = u_t$ on C, and since $u_t^{n_k}$ converges weakly in $L_2(C)$ to v', the lemma is proved. □

Corollary 3.3. *Suppose that (i) and (iii) from Assumption 3.1 hold, and let u^n and u be the solutions of the problems $\Pi(A_n, \psi^n)$ and $\Pi(A, \psi)$. Set $u^n = 1$ and $u = 1$ on A_n and A respectively. Then for each t, $u_t^n \to u_t$ weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $n \to \infty$.*

Proof. Let $g \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $g = 1$ on a compact set B such that $A_0 \subset \underline{B}$. Then $u^n - g$ and $u - g$ solve the problems $\Pi_0(A_n, \psi^n - g, -\frac{1}{2}\Delta g)$ and $\Pi_0(A, \psi - g, -\frac{1}{2}\Delta g)$ and the result follows by Lemma 3.2. □

For two compact subsets of $\mathbb{R}^d$, A_1 and A_2, we denote by $d(A_1, A_2)$ the Hausdorff distance, that is

$$d(A_1, A_2) = \inf \left\{ \rho \geq 0 \mid A_1 \subset (A_2 + \overline{B}_\rho), \ A_2 \subset (A_1 + \overline{B}_\rho) \right\}.$$

In Lemma 3.4 below we will need the following:

Remark 3.1. Let $A \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ be compact such that $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$ is a Carathéory set (i.e. $\partial(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A) = \partial(\overline{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A})$). If $u \in H^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ and $u = 0$ a.e. on A, then $u \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$. To see this, suppose first that $\text{supp}(u) \subset B_R$, where R is large enough, so that $A \subset R$. It follows that $B_R \setminus A$ is a Carathéodory set, and by Theorem 7.3 (ii), page 436 in [9], if $u \in H_0^1(B_R)$, and $u = 0$ a.e. on A, then $u \in H_0^1(B_R \setminus A)$, and therefore $u \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$. For general u we

can take $\zeta \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d)$, such that $0 \le \zeta \le 1$ and $\zeta(x) = 1$ for $|x| \le 1$, and set $\zeta^n(x) = \zeta(x/n)$. Then by the previous discussion $\zeta^n u \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$ and since $\zeta^n u \to u$ in $H^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$ we get that $u \in H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$.

Assumption 3.2.

(i) $\xi^n \to \xi$ weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$
(ii) $f^n \to f$ weakly in $L_2([0,T]; L_2(\mathbb{R}^d))$
(iii) $d(A, A_n) \to 0$, $|A \setminus A_n| \to 0$, as $n \to \infty$, and $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$ is a Carathéodory set.

Lemma 3.4. *Suppose Assumption 3.2 holds, and let u^n and u be the solutions of the problems $\Pi_0(A_n, \xi^n, f^n)$ and $\Pi_0(A, \xi, f)$. Let us extend u^n and u to 0 on A_n and A respectively. Then*

i) *$u^n \to u$ weakly in $\mathbb{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$,*
ii) *$u_t^n \to u_t$ weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, as $n \to \infty$, and for any $t \in [0,T]$.*

Proof. As in the proof of Lemma 3.2 it suffices to find a subsequences such that the corresponding convergences take place. By standard estimates, there exists a constant N depending only on d, κ, T and K, such that for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$

$$\sup_{t \le T} \|u_t^n\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \int_0^T \|u_t^n\|^2_{H_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d)}\, dt \le N(\|\xi^n\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + \int_0^T \|f_t^n\|^2_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)}). \tag{3.12}$$

Therefore, there exists a subsequence $(u^{n_k})_{k=1}^\infty \subset \mathbb{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$, and a function $v \in \mathbb{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$ such that $u^{n_k} \to v$ weakly in $\mathbb{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d)$.

For $\phi \in C_c^\infty(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$, since $d(A, A_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$, we have that for all k large enough $\operatorname{supp}(\phi) \subset \mathbb{R}^d \setminus A_{n_k}$. Also, u^{n_k} solves $\Pi_0(A_{n_k}, \xi^{n_k}, f^{n_k})$, and therefore

$$(u_t^{n_k}, \phi) = (\xi^{n_k}, \phi) + \int_0^t \left((f_s^{n_k}, \phi) - (a_s^{ij} \partial_i u_s^{n_k}, \partial_j \phi)\right)\, ds, \quad \text{for all } t \in [0,T]. \tag{3.13}$$

which by letting $k \to \infty$ gives

$$(v_t, \phi) = (\xi, \phi) + \int_0^t \left((f_s, \phi) - (a_s^{ij} \partial_i v_s, \partial_j \phi)\right)\, ds \quad \text{for a.e. } t \in [0,T], \tag{3.14}$$

Notice that for $\phi \in L_\infty(A)$, $\psi \in L_\infty((0,T)$,

$$\begin{aligned} \Big| \int_0^T \int_A v_t \phi \psi_t \, dxdt \Big| &= \lim_{k \to \infty} \Big| \int_0^T \int_{A \setminus A_{n_k}} u_t^{n_k} \phi \psi_t \, dxdt \Big| \\ &\le T \|\phi\|_{L_\infty(A)} \|\psi\|_{L_\infty((0,T))} \sup_{t \le T} \|u_t^{n_k}\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} |A \setminus A_{n_k}| \\ &\to 0, \text{ as } k \to \infty, \end{aligned}$$

by assumption and (3.12). Consequently for almost all $t \in (0,T)$, $v_t = 0$ for a.e. $x \in A$. By virtue of Remark 3.1, we have that $v \in \mathbb{H}_0^1(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$,

which combined with (3.14) implies that $v \in \mathscr{H}^1_0(\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A)$ and is the unique solution of the problem $\Pi_0(A, \xi, f)$. This proves (i).

Let us fix $t \in [0,T]$. By (3.12) there exists a subsequence $u^{n_k}_t$ that converges weakly to some $v' \in L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. Again, for $\phi \in C^\infty_c(C)$ and k large enough, we have that (3.13) holds. As $k \to \infty$, the right hand side of (3.13) converges to the right hand side of (3.14), which is equal to (u_t, ϕ), while for our fixed t, the left hand side of (3.11) converges to (v', ϕ). Hence, $v' = u_t$ on $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$. Also if $\phi \in L_\infty(A)$

$$\int_A v'\phi \, dx = \lim_{k\to\infty} \int_A u^{n_k}_t \phi \, dx \leq \sup \|u^n_t\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \|\phi\|_{L_\infty(A)} |A \setminus A_{n_k}| \to 0,$$

as $k \to \infty$. Therefore $v' = 0 = u_t$ on A. This shows that $v' = u_t$ on $\mathbb{R}^d$ and the lemma is proved. □

As with Lemma 3.2, we have the following corollary, whose proof is similar to the one of Corollary 3.3.

Corollary 3.5. *Suppose that (i) and (iii) from Assumption 3.2 hold and let u^n and u be the solutions of the problems $\Pi(A_n, \psi^n)$ and $\Pi(A, \psi)$. Set $u^n = 1$ and $u = 1$ on A_n and A respectively. Then for each t, $u^n_t \to u_t$ weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $n \to \infty$.*

4. Proofs of Theorems 2.3 and 2.4

Proof. of Theorem 2.3. Let us assume for now that $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A$ has smooth boundary, ψ is compactly supported and smooth. It follows under these extra conditions that $u \in C^\infty([0,T] \times \overline{\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A})$. Also, by the De Giorgi-Moser-Nash theorem v is continuous in $(0,T) \times (\mathbb{R}^d \setminus P_H A)$.

First notice that $0 \leq u, v \leq 1$. Let us extend $u = 1$ and $v = 1$ on A and $P_H A$ respectively so that they are defined on the whole $\mathbb{R}^d$, and for a function f let us use the notation $\overline{f}(x) := f(\sigma_H(x))$. Clearly it suffices to show that for each $t \in (0,T]$

$$w_t := v_t + \overline{v}_t - u_t - \overline{u}_t \leq 0, \text{ for a.e. } x \in H^c.$$

Suppose that the opposite holds, that is,

$$\sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{H^c} w_t(x) = \sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_t(x) =: \alpha > 0.$$

Then we have that

$$\sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{\Gamma_i} w_t(x) = \alpha, \tag{4.15}$$

for some $i \in \{1,2,3,4\}$, where

$$\Gamma_1 := A \cap A_r \cap H^c, \quad \Gamma_2 := (\underline{A} \setminus A_H) \cap H^c$$
$$\Gamma_3 := (\underline{A_H} \setminus A) \cap H^c, \ \Gamma_4 := H^c \setminus (A \cup A_H).$$

(Notice that the boundaries of A and A_H are of measure zero, since they are smooth). On Γ_1, by definition $w_t = 0$ for any $t \in [0,T]$, and therefore (4.15) holds for some $i \in \{2,3,4\}$. Suppose it holds for $i = 2$. Since the

initial conditions are compactly supported, we can find an open rectangle R with $A \cup A_H \subset R$, such that

$$\sup_{(0,T)\times\overline{R^c}} \max\{u_t(x), v_t(x)\} \le \alpha/10. \tag{4.16}$$

Since $w_t = v_t - \overline{u}_t =: \hat{w}_t$ on Γ_2 we have

$$\sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{\Theta} \hat{w}_t \ge \alpha, \tag{4.17}$$

where $\Theta = (H^c \setminus A_H) \cap R$. Since

(i) $\limsup_{(0,T)\times\Theta\ni(t,x)\to(t_0,x_0)} \hat{w}_t \le 0$, for any $(t_0, x_0) \in (0,T) \times \partial A_H$,
(ii) $P_H\psi - \overline{\psi} \le 0$ on H^c,
(iii) inequality (4.16) holds,

we obtain by virtue of Lemma 3.1 that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $(t_0, x_0) \in (0,T) \times \partial H$ (in fact $x_0 \in \partial H \setminus A_H$ due to (i) above) such that

$$\limsup_{(0,T)\times\Theta\ni(t,x)\to(t_0,x_0)} \hat{w}_t \ge \alpha - \varepsilon.$$

Notice that $\hat{w}$ is continuous at (t_0, x_0) and therefore $\hat{w}_{t_0}(x_0) \ge \alpha - \varepsilon$. This implies that

$$w_{t_0}(x_0) = 2\hat{w}_{t_0}(x_0) \ge 2(\alpha - \varepsilon) = 2 \sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{\mathbb{R}^d} w_t - 2\varepsilon,$$

which is a contradiction for ε small enough . If (4.15) holds for $i = 3$ then in the same way we have that

$$\sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{\Theta'} \tilde{w}_t \ge \alpha, \tag{4.18}$$

where $\tilde{w}_t = v_t - u_t$ and $\Theta' = (H^c \setminus A) \cap R$. This inequality leads to a similar contradiction.

Finally let us assume that (4.15) holds for $i = 4$. In particular then we have

$$\sup_{(0,T]} \sup_{G} w_t \ge \alpha, \text{ where } G := R \setminus (A \cup A_H).$$

By virtue of (4.16), and since $P_H\psi \lhd_H \psi$, Lemma 3.1 implies that for any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $(t_0, x_0) \in (0,T] \times \partial(A \cup A_H)$ such that

$$\limsup_{(0,T)\times G\ni(t,x)\to(t_0,x_0)} w_t(x) \ge \alpha - \varepsilon.$$

Notice that $x_0 \in \partial A \cap A_H^c$ or $x_0 \in \partial A_H \cap A^c$, because if it belongs to $\partial A \cap \partial A_H$ then the lim sup above is less than or equal to zero. Let us consider the first case. We can assume further that $(t_0, x_0) \in \partial A \cap A_H^c \cap H^c$ because of symmetry. Let $(t_n, x_n) \in G$ be a sequence converging to (t_0, x_0) such that $w_{t_n}(x_n) \to \alpha - \varepsilon$. For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ sufficiently large, we have $w_{t_n}(x_n) \ge \alpha - 2\varepsilon$ and $u_{t_n}(x_n) \ge 1 - \varepsilon$, the last by the continuity of u up to the parabolic boundary. Then we have for all n large

$$\alpha - 2\varepsilon \le w_{t_n}(x_n) \le v_{t_n}(x_n) + 1 - (1 - \varepsilon) - \overline{u}_{t_n}(x_n).$$

This now implies (4.17) which we showed leads to a contradiction. For the second case, we can assume again that $(t_0, x_0) \in \partial A_H \cap A^c \cap H^c$. This in the same manner leads to (4.18), which also leads to contradiction.

For general A and ψ, let A_n be a sequence of compact sets such that for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A_n$ has smooth boundary, $A \subset A_{n+1} \subset A_n$, and $A = \cap_n A_n$ (see e.g. page 60 in [7]) . Let $0 \leq \psi^n \leq 1$ be smooth with compact support such that $\psi^n = 1$ on A_n, and $\|\psi^n - \psi\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $n \to 0$. Then we also have that $\|P_H\psi^n - P_H\psi\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \to 0$ as $n \to 0$, $P_H A \subset P_H A_{n+1} \subset P_H A_n$ for any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $P_H A = \cap_n P_H A_n$ (see [4]). Let u^n and v^n be the solutions of the problems $\Pi(A_n, \psi^n)$ and $\Pi(P_H A_n, P_H\psi_n)$ respectively. By Lemma 3.2 we have that u^n_t and v^n_t converge to u_t and v_t weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$. In particular $z^n := (u^n_t, v^n_t)$ converges weakly to $z := (v_t, u_t)$ in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d; \mathbb{R}^2)$. By Mazur's lemma there exists a sequence $(g_k = (g^1_k, g^2_k))_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ of convex combinations of z^n such that the convergence takes place strongly. Then we can find a subsequence $g_{k(l)}$, $l \in \mathbb{N}$, where the convergence takes place for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. For each l we have

$$g^1_{k(l)} + \overline{g^1_{k(l)}} = \sum_{i\in C} c_i(v^i_t + \overline{v^i}_t) \leq \sum_{i\in C} c_i(u^i_t + \overline{u^i}_t) = g^2_{k(l)} + \overline{g^2_{k(l)}}$$

where $C \subset \mathbb{N}$ is a finite set and $c_i \geq 0$, $\sum_{i\in C} c_i = 1$. Letting $l \to \infty$ finishes the proof.

□

Proof. of Theorem 2.4. First, let us assume that

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t(x)\ dx < \infty,$$

or else the conclusion of the theorem is obviously true. Since $|A| > 0$, it follows from [5] that there exist $H_i \in \mathcal{H}$, $i \in \mathbb{N}$, such that

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} \Big(\|\psi^* - \psi^n\|_{L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)} + |A^* \Delta A_n| + d(A^*, A_n) \Big) = 0,$$

where

$$\psi^n := P_{H_n} ... P_{H_1}\psi,\ A_n := P_{H_n} ... P_{H_1} A.$$

Let u^n be the solution of the problem $\Pi(A_n, \psi^n)$. For $t \in [0, T]$, by virtue of Theorem 2.3, we have by induction

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u^n_t\ dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t\ dx, \tag{4.19}$$

for all $n \geq 0$. By Lemma 3.4 ($|A| > 0$ and therefore $\mathbb{R}^d \setminus A^*$ is obviously a Carathéodory set) we have that $u^n_t \to v_t$ weakly in $L_2(\mathbb{R}^d)$ as $n \to \infty$. Hence we can find a sequence of convex combination that converges strongly, and a subsequence of it, let us call it $(v^n)_{n=1}^\infty$, such that $v^n \to v_t$ for a.e. $x \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Since for each n, v^n is convex combination of elements from $(u^n_t)_{n=1}^\infty$, we have by (4.19)

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} v^n\ dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} u_t\ dx,$$

which combined with Fatou's lemma brings the proof to an end. □

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Takis Konstantopoulos and Tomas Juskevicius for the useful discussions.

References

[1] A. Alvino, P.-L. Lions, G. Trombetti, Comparison results for elliptic and parabolic equations via symmetrization: a new approach.
[2] C. Bandle, On symmetrizations in parabolic equations. J. Analyse Math. 30 (1976), 98-112.
[3] M. van den Berg, On the expected volume of intersection of independent Wiener sausages and the asymptotic behaviour of some related integrals. J. Funct. Anal. 222 (2005), no. 1, 114-128.
[4] F. Brock, A.Y. Solynin, An approach to symmetrization via polarization. Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 352 (2000), no. 4, 1759-1796.
[5] A. Burchard, M. Fortier, Random polarizations. Adv. Math. 234 (2013), 550-573.
[6] A. Burchard, M. Schmuckenschlger, Comparison theorems for exit times, Geom. Funct. Anal. 11 (2001), no. 4, 651-692.
[7] D. Daners, Domain Perturbation for Linear and Semi-Linear Boundary Value Problems, Handbook of differential equations: stationary partial differential equations. Vol. VI. Edited by M. Chipot. Handbook of Differential Equations. Elsevier/North-Holland, Amsterdam, 2008. xx+597 pp.
[8] K. Dareiotis and I. Gyöngy, A Comparison Principle for Stochastic Integro-Differential Equations. Potential Anal. 41 (2014), no. 4, 1203-1222.
[9] M. C. Delfour, J.-P. Zolsio, Shapes and geometries. Metrics, analysis, differential calculus, and optimization. Second edition. Advances in Design and Control, 22. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics (SIAM), Philadelphia, PA, 2011. xxiv+622 pp.
[10] A. Grigor'yan, L. Saloff-Coste, Hitting probabilities for Brownian motion on Riemannian manifolds. J. Math. Pures Appl. (9) 81 (2002), no. 2, 115-142.
[11] N.V. Krylov, B.L. Rozovskii, Stochastic evolution equations. (Russian) Current problems in mathematics, Vol. 14 (Russian), pp. 71-147, 256, Akad. Nauk SSSR, Vsesoyuz. Inst. Nauchn. i Tekhn. Informatsii, Moscow, 1979.
[12] S. Kesavan, Symmetrization and applications. Series in Analysis, 3. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd., Hackensack, NJ, 2006. xii+148 pp.
[13] Partial differential equations of elliptic type. Papers from the conference held in Cortona, October 12-16, 1992. Edited by Angelo Alvino, Eugene Fabes and Giorgio Talenti. Symposia Mathematica, XXXV. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1994. vi+223 pp.
[14] Y. Peres, P. Sousi, An isoperimetric inequality for the Wiener sausage, Geom. Funct. Anal. 22 (2012), no. 4, 1000-1014.
[15] G. Talenti, Elliptic equations and rearrangements. Ann. Scuola Norm. Sup. Pisa Cl. Sci. (4) 3 (1976), no. 4, 697-718.

Department of Mathematics, Uppsala University, Box 480, 751 06 Uppsala, Sweden

E-mail address: konstantinos.dareiotis@math.uu.se